

75. (Previously presented) A computer-readable medium as in claim 72, further including computer-executable instructions to perform the step of applying late binding by the recipient application to reference data elements in the unserialized dictionary object.

76. (Previously presented) A computer-readable medium as in claim 72, further including computer-executable instructions to perform the steps of:

determining, by a message queuing server of the first message queuing machine, whether the message object supports persistence;

determining, by the message queuing server, a size of the message object and creating a buffer for persistent storage of the message object.

REMARKS

The Final Action of July 7, 2003 has been carefully considered with the cited references. In view of the following remarks and the claim amendments presented above, it is believed that the claims should be allowable over the cited art.

Claims 67-76 are currently pending in this application, with claims 67 and 72 in independent form. The Final Action rejected all the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyer et al. U.S. Patent 5,754,849, in view of "*Microsoft Message Queue Server Reviewer's Guide*" (hereinafter "the MMQS Guide") and Vanderbilt et al. U.S. Patent 5,793,965. As to claims 67 and 72, the Final Action asserted that Dyer teaches all the limitations except (1) that the first/second message communication machines are the first/ second message queuing machines, (2) steps of the recipient application identifying a data element in the unserialized dictionary object having a data type not recognized by the recipient application; and

the recipient application sending a query to the first message queuing machine to learn about said data type. As to (1), the Final Action asserted that it would have been obvious to implement the first/second message communication machines of Dyer as respective first/second message queuing machines in view of the teachings of the MMQS Guide.

Regarding the limitation of (2), the Final Action asserted:

As to (2), Vanderbilt teaches message communication, wherein a **recipient application** identifies a **data element received** having a data type not recognized by (does not know the type) and the recipient application sends a query to a sender machine to learn about the data type (invoke remote IS_A function). See col. 10, lines 2-55. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include into Dyer steps of the recipient application identifying a data element in the unserialized dictionary object having a data type not recognized by the recipient application; and the recipient application sending a query to the first message queuing machines to learn about said data type. ...

The Office Action also rejected the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Dyer, the Blakeley et al. "*Messaging and Queuing Using the MQI*" reference, and Vanderbilt, asserting that this combination provides similar teachings as those of the combination of Dyer, the MMQS Guide, and Vanderbilt.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection is not fully supported because the combined references do not teach all the claim limitations. Specifically, as to (2), contrary to the assertions of the Final Action, the Vanderbilt reference does not teach or suggest message communication "wherein a recipient application identifies a **data element received** having a data type not recognized by [the recipient application] (does not know the type) and the recipient application sends a query to a sender machine to learn about the data type." As clearly stated in the Vanderbilt reference, Vanderbilt discloses a method and apparatus of "checking the type of **an object located on a remote computer** in a distributed object environment computing system." Vanderbilt, Abstract; col. 3, lines 41-45. As shown

in FIG. 1 of Vanderbilt, the type check method is for a client object 29 on a client machine 22 to determine whether the remotely located server object 40 on a server machine 24 is of a specific type. *Id.* Since the discovery/query is directed to a remotely located object on a remote computer, the client machine in the network system of Vanderbilt clearly has not "received" the object whose data element type is to be identified. Vanderbilt has no mention of identifying a "received data element" in a received unserialized dictionary object as having a type that is unrecognized, and then querying the sender machine about that data type.

To emphasize this point of distinction, applicant has amended claims 67 and 72 to recite that the recipient application identifies a data element in "the unserialized dictionary object **received** from the second message queuing machine" having a data type not recognized by the recipient application. It should be noted that the "received" aspect was already in claims 67 and 72 as previously presented, as the claims call for the second message queuing machine "receiving" the message object and "passing" the unserialized dictionary object to the recipient application. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Since Vanderbilt does not teach or suggest this limitation as discussed above, the Section 103 rejection is not fully supported, and claims 67 and 72 should be allowable over the combined references. Since the remaining claims all depend from claims 67 and 72, they should also be allowable.

In this regard, applicant further submits that it would not have been obvious to combine Dyer and Vanderbilt. Dyer teaches delivering a value object with the types of the data elements of the object explicitly specified in the object (Dyer col. 5, lines 41-45). In contrast, Vanderbilt teaches a method and system to query the type of a remotely located object on a remote computer. These two approaches are not analogous. In fact, Vanderbilt,


In re Appln. of Ilan Caron
Application No. 09/114,231

with its prerequisite of a remotely located object, teaches away from the delivery of an object with type information specified therein as taught by Dyer. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious for those skilled in the art to combine the two references.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Y. Kurt Chang, Reg. No. 41,397
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: September 26, 2003